DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 234 945 RC 014 320

AUTHOR Alejandro, Franco; Marenco, Eduardo, Jr.
TITLE A Mechanism for Increasing Participation by Minorities and Women in Advanced Study and Research in Education. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 83p.; Project period: September 1, 1978-August 30, 1982.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; Achievement Gains; Disadvantaged Schools; Educationally Disadvantaged; *Educational Researchers; Expenditure Per Student; *Higher Education; Hispanic Americans; Mexican American Education; *Mexican Americans; *Postdoctoral Education; *Professional Development; Research Opportunities
IDENTIFIERS Los Angeles Unified School District CA; *Mexican American Legal Defense Educational Fund

ABSTRACT

The Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund's program to increase participation of minority and women junior faculty members in advanced study and research in education resulted in numerous accomplishments by the program's three scholars-in-residence. Dr. David Jess Leon (1979-1980) produced a major publication, "The Struggle for Access: Minority Students in a California University," reviewed social science literature on higher education, did a survey of California higher education minority assistance programs, developed research proposals, and presented his research at conferences and professional meetings. Dr. M. Susana Navarro (1980-1981) focused on research into testing and Hispanic access to higher education, produced numerous articles and position papers in both areas, made extensive contacts with education researchers and administrators, and assisted in the development and advancement of coalitions to pursue higher education issues. Dr. Ruben Espinosa (1981-1982) conducted a major study on Los Angeles Unified School District's expenditure patterns and school size, and found that the district spent 40% less on Hispanic elementary students than on white children and that most Hispanic students face ghetto school environments and substandard educational services. Appendices include resumes, summaries of Leon's and Espinosa's publications, and Navarro's statement on the status of Hispanics in higher education. (MH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Mexican American
Legal Defense
and Educational Fund

28 Geary Street
San Francisco, CA 94108
(415) 981-5800

MALDEF

RC

ED234945

A Mechanism for Increasing Participation by Minorities and Women in Advanced Study and Research in Education

Funded by the National Institute of Education

September 1, 1978-August 30, 1982

FINAL REPORT

OCT 1983
RECEIVED
ERIC/CRESS

Program Officer: Franco Alejandro, Ph.D.

Project Director: Eduardo Marenco, Jr., Ph.D.

RC014320

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

National Office
28 Geary Street
San Francisco, CA 94108
(415) 981-5800

Regional Offices

343 South Dearborn Street
Suite 910
Chicago, IL 60604
(312) 427-9363

250 W. Fourteenth Avenue
Suite 308
Denver, CO 80204
(303) 893-1893

1636 West Eighth Street
Suite 319
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 383-6952

517 Petroleum Commerce Bldg.
201 North St. Mary's Street
San Antonio, TX 78205
(512) 224-5476

1411 K Street, NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 393-5111

Contributions Are Deductible for US Income Tax Purposes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

With the support of the National Institute of Education, MALDEF undertook a unique three-year scholar-in-residence program of advanced educational research and career development to selected minority and women junior faculty members and Ph.D. candidates who have completed all requirements for the doctorate except the dissertation. The objective of the program was to provide career development, professional enhancement and opportunities to do research for individuals involved in the program.

MALDEF's three Scholars-In-Residence, worked on educational policy research of particular interest to minorities and women. They were David Jess Leon, Ph.D, (1979-1980); M. Susana Navarro, Ph.D. (1980-1981), and Ruben Espinosa, Ph.D. (1981-1982). Each scholar worked as an integral component of MALDEF's national departments in policy analysis and research, community education and civil rights litigation which operate in conjunction with nation-wide networks of policy researchers, community clienteles and policy makers. Scholars conducted research which resulted in publications and in presentations to decision-makers.

Dr. David Less Leon, Ph.D. produced a major publication as part of this project, The Struggle For Access. It was published by the University of Texas Press in 1981. Before accepting his assignment with MALDEF, he was Assistant Professor of Education at the University of California, Berkeley. He is now Assistant Academic Vice President at Fresno State University.

Dr. M. Susana Navarro focused her research on testing and Hispanic access to higher education. She produced numerous articles and position papers in both areas. In addition, she interacted with Hispanics in higher education, academicians and other involved in testing and higher education. As a result of her work, she was invited to participate in numerous higher education research projects and advisory councils. She is currently Research Director of MALDEF's Access to Higher Education Project.

Dr. Ruben Espinosa, Associate Professor, College of Education at San Diego State University conducted a major study on Los Angeles Unified School District's (LAUSD) expenditure patterns and school size which found that the LAUSD is spending 40 percent less on Hispanic grade school students than on white children and that most Hispanic students face ghetto school environments and substandard educational services.

A Mechanism for Increasing Participation
by Minorities and Women
in Advanced Study and Research in Education

I. Introduction

Between 1979 and 1982, MALDEF conducted a three year National Institute of Education funded program entitled, A Mechanism for Increasing Participation by Minorities and Women in Advanced Study and Research in Education. This is the final report of the program which ended August 31, 1982.

The objective of the program was to provide career development, professional enhancement and research opportunities for individuals involved in the program. We called these individuals Scholars-In-Residence. In each year of the program, a single Scholar-In-Residence followed a chosen course of education policy research. By being associated with MALDEF, scholars were exposed to diverse MALDEF staff consisting of researchers, policy analysts, attorneys with an emphasis on education litigation, community outreach persons and MALDEF's national network of contacts in academic, professional, community and policy-making circles. This program is based on the premise that increased exposure to fellow researchers, and institutional administrators and experience in educational research would help Hispanic scholars advance their professional careers.

Dr. David Jess Leon (1979-1980), the first of the three scholars, since his tenure as Scholar-In-Residence, has advanced his academic standing from Assistant Professor to Assistant Academic Vice President.

Dr. M. Susana Navarro (1980-1981) continued her policy research in the areas of educational testing and Hispanic access to higher education. She assisted in the development of coalitions formed to pursue issues of higher education, as well as, the advancement of strategies of existing coalitions and groups. Also, she made extensive contacts with education researchers and administrators. As a result of her work, she now participates in numerous higher education research projects and advisory councils. She is currently the Research Director of MALDEF's Access to Higher Education Project.

Dr. Ruben Espinosa (1981-1982) conducted a major statistical, comparative study between the services and facilities of Los Angeles Unified School District's for Hispanic and non-Hispanic students. He found that the school district is spending 40 percent less on Hispanic grade school student than on non-Hispanic students, and, that many Hispanic

students face ghetto school environments and substandard services. Dr. Espinosa made several recommendations that he will present to school officials.

There were countless others who assisted the Scholars-In-Residence by reviewing articles and manuscripts or suggesting effective strategies and advice. Some of them are listed in appendix A.

The following is a concise description of the activities conducted by each Scholar-In-Residence.

II. Activities of Scholars in Residence

A. Dr. David Jess Leon (1979-1980)

MALDEF hired Dr. David Jess Leon as the first Scholar-in-Residence/Program Coordinator in 1979. His goal was to further develop his research abilities by investigating the relation between minority assistance programs and the rate of recruitment/retention of Hispanics in higher education.

While at MALDEF Dr. Leon's activities included;

° a review of social service literature on higher education;

° an exploratory survey of California higher education minority assistance programs;

° development of education research proposals;

° presentations on his research at conferences and professional meetings; and

° completion of the manuscript for the book entitled, The Struggle for Access: Minority Students in a California University.

1. Social Science Literature Review

Dr. Leon expanded his knowledge of higher education materials through an extensive review of 100 social science publications and articles on higher education produced from 1970-1980. The articles proved useful in the preparation of papers and proposals;

2. Exploratory Survey of Minority Assistance Programs

Dr. Leon set out to identify and analyze minority assistance programs that are instructionally effective for minority college students through an exploratory study. (Instructionally effective programs are defined as those that successfully transfer minority students in two years to public/private colleges and universities.) More than 100 of 130 EOP directors who received the questionnaire, responded. The questionnaire explored five areas, program leadership and philosophy, organizational structure of the program, college environment, faculty input, and community influence.

3. Research Proposals

Dr. Leon developed several research proposals relating to Hispanics in education. Two of the proposals submitted to the National Institute of Education (NIE) for consideration dealt with the impact of testing on children in general. The third proposal analyzed the impact of desegregation on children, in general, and Hispanics, in particular. A preliminary proposal, "Organizational Differences in EOP Programs," was also submitted to NIE. Although the proposals were denied funding, we were asked to reformulate our research designs and urged to resubmit them.

4. Presentations

Dr. Leon attended and made oral presentations of ongoing research at local and national conferences and professional meetings. A list of the presentations is attached as appendix B. At these meetings, Dr. Leon made numerous contacts with experts, including social scientists, administrators, lawyers, and community people. All of these people helped in the refinement of the goals of this project.

5. Completion of Manuscript

Dr. Leon was able to complete the 260 page manuscript entitled, The Struggle for Access: Minority Students in a California University. It was published by the University of Texas Press, in conjunction with the Center of Mexican American Studies at the University of Texas.

This manuscript is the salient result of the Dr. Leon's work. It examines the career of the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) at the University of California, Santa Barbara from its inception in 1966 through many years of crisis and protest to the status that seemed to descend on it in 1975. In general, it describes how one minority assistance program improved the recruitment and enhanced the retention of

underrepresented students from disadvantaged backgrounds. As a case study, it offers vivid examples of the bureaucratic maneuverings through which a university administration can seek to limit minority participation in its affairs, and of the tactics minorities can employ to counter these ploys.

An article based on the manuscript appeared in the Humboldt Journal of Social Relations.

6. Mr. Leon's Professional Development

This grant enabled Dr. Leon significant professional opportunities to enhance his career and complete research projects. It allowed him to finish Struggle for Access. Furthermore, he was able to meet and work with a number of experts in the field, and this both enhanced his own research and contributed to concerns of MALDEF about access of Hispanics in higher education.

Finally, his ideas and proposals may have important consequences both for the academic investigation of Hispanic issues, and for the legal pursuit of remedies of existing equalities.

B. Dr. M. Susana Navarro (1980-1981)

Dr. M. Susana Navarro, completed her dissertation under the well-known psychometrist, Dr. Richard E. Snow, Harvard, shortly before she was selected as the program's second scholar-in-residence. Early in the 1970s, while working as a research analyst for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, she co-authored two Commission reports on Mexican American education entitled, Mexican American Education in Texas: A Function of Wealth and Toward Quality Education for Mexican Americans.

During her one year tenure at MALDEF, Dr. Navarro made extensive professional contacts and wrote a number of articles on her research. As a result, she was asked to participate in numerous higher education research projects and advisory councils.

* She has been named to the College Entrance Examination Board's National Admissions Services Council. The council advises the Board a member institutions on college and university admissions services and practices.

* She was selected as a participant in a national conference that took place in 1982 which made policy recommendations regarding Hispanic involvement in higher education.

* In addition, she was named a consultant on a Woodrow Wilson Foundation study which reviewed the status of Hispanics in higher education in California.

Her activities were divided into three major issue areas, testing, Hispanic access to higher education, and bilingual education.

1. Testing

a. Publications

Dr. Navarro wrote an article on cognitive styles of Chicano students. The article reviews Witkin's field dependence/independence cognitive style theory and supporting research, and examines the literature focused on Chicano children. It also summarized research conducted by Dr. Navarro which replicates some of the past work with Chicano students and attempts to clarify unresolves issues. The article was submitted to a journal for publication.

Dr. Navarro finalized a first draft of an article reviewing the literature on a type of pre-test intervention strategy termed tuning. Tuning refers to minimal training prior to testing and may include classification of task requirements provision of extended or additional practices items, or suggestion of a strategy for approaching the task.

The product of Dr. Navarro's extensive review of the Educational Testing Service/College Board policies and programs and meetings with numerous college/university administrators and test researchers resulted in recommendations to the Educational Testing Service on guidelines for correct test use.

b. Presentations

In the presentation of a paper to the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Dr. Navarro discussed both cognitive style and tuning.

Other public appearances in which Dr. Navarro presented her research and findings include;

* a discussion of the history and current status Chicano education at the Federal Defense Language Institute in Monterey;

* a discussion of the impact of standardized tests on Hispanics and her research on pre-test intervention programs on a local radio show;

* a panel on Hispanic education in California before California statewide education office candidates.

2. Hispanic Access to Higher Education

a. College Entrance Examination Board

Dr. Navarro reviewed existing programs and made recommendations to the College Entrance Examination Board for innovative programs which would increase the pool of Hispanics eligible for college admission.

b. Examination of Admissions Policy Changes

Dr. Navarro assisted in a thorough analysis of how admissions policy changes proposed by the University of Texas and the University of California would impact on Hispanic enrollment. Meetings were held with members of faculty committees overseeing the proposed change to discuss potential problems with the plans and recommended changes. Also, Dr. Navarro developed and delivered testimony on the status of Hispanics in higher education and on the need for affirmative action to increase the numbers of Hispanic students, staff and faculty in colleges and universities.

c. Meetings with Researchers and Administrators

Dr. Navarro's work on higher education issues also included a series of meetings with various researchers and administrators to discuss community colleges and admissions policies. She met with University of California staff to share ideas on programs designed to increase the pool of Hispanics qualified for U.C. admission and to discuss proposed changes in U.C. admission policies.

d. Meetings with Hispanic Coalitions and Groups

Dr. Navarro met regularly with two Hispanic coalitions to explore collaborative efforts. She met with the Board of the National Chicano Council on Higher Education (NCCHE) and with the Hispanic Higher Education Coalition (HHEC). Discussed were possible collaborative efforts on research aimed at examining the effects of the SAT on Hispanic access to higher education, proposals for programs aimed at preparing Hispanic students for college or professional school entrance examinations, meetings of Hispanic college university faculty to focus on issues such as tenure, staff and administrator's concerns, and undergraduate/graduate Hispanic student enrollment and support services.

Dr. Navarro assisted in the coordination of a meeting of Hispanic administrators and staff in higher education in California.

3. Bilingual Education

Dr. Navarro attended the annual meeting of the National Association for Bilingual Education in Boston. In addition to attending sessions, and meeting with various researchers, she met with the American Coalition on Bilingual Education , a national network of bilingual education scholars, attorneys, and practitioners. As part of that work, she assisted in the review and development of position papers, and information dissemination strategies for the group.

She sat in on several panels and made presentations at meetings of the California Association for Bilingual Education.

Dr. Navarro assisted a group of scholars, researchers and attorneys concerned with bilingual education by reviewing and compiling results from evaluations of and research on the programs.

She participated in a meeting of researchers and attorneys held at Stanford to develop alternatives to current federal policy on bilingual education. She also assisted a group of researchers in reviewing bilingual education evaluations for use in future congressional hearings and testimony.

C. Dr. Ruben Espinosa

Dr. Ruben Espinosa, the third Scholar-In-Residence, continued his research into public school financing through a study of the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) entitled, A Comparison of School Finance and Facilities Between Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Schools During Fiscal Year 1980-1981.

Dr. Espinosa's findings have provided facts backing up Hispanic parent's complaints that their children have been relegated to overcrowded, rundown, inferior schools and education. Specifically, his finding are:

1. The LAUSD spends fewer dollars per-pupil in Hispanic elementary and junior high schools than it does in white schools;

2. The LAUSD actually spends less per-pupil on schools attended by poor students than on schools attended by students from wealthier families;

3. There are 383 percent more students in Hispanic schools when compared to white schools;

4. Data show that third grade reading achievement in LAUSD Hispanic elementary schools is 25 percent below white schools and 11 points below the district average;

5. As schools grow in percentage of Hispanic students, the number of student enrollment increases, school spending goes down and so does academic achievement. The opposite is true of White schools; and

6. Hispanic schools are greatly overcrowded compared with white schools and prove a lower quality school environment.

The conclusions drawn from this study are:

1. The district must equalize per-pupil, basic state and district funding;

2. The district should develop a plan to relieve overcrowding in highly-Hispanic schools;

3. The state government must strengthen its efforts to end discriminatory treatment of Hispanic students; and

4. The state legislature should consider dividing the LAUSD and other school districts in Los Angeles County to create new districts with equal educational facilities.

Through his collaboration with MALDEF's National Institute of Education project Dr. Espinosa was able to develop and implement this technical research and policy oriented framework which would prove or disprove Hispanic parents' concerns about the financing of Los Angeles Unified School District's public schools. The result was this objective statistical study.

In the near future, the study's findings and recommendations will be disseminated to LAUSD administrators and Los Angeles and California state policy makers.

III. Conclusion

MALDEF provided a unique environment and opportunity for minority and women education researchers to expand their knowledge and contacts in the research and public policy fields. The Scholars-In-Residence became an important part of MALDEF's three-pronged approach of combining litigation, research/public policy and community education to solve Hispanic problems and make the Hispanic community stronger and self sufficient.

Dr. Leon has made significant career advances since his tenure at MALDEF. Dr. Navarro has found a niche at MALDEF in which to continue her collaboration with education attorneys, researchers and administrators on higher education issues. Dr. Espinosa has increased his knowledge of public school financing through his thorough analysis of financing of Los Angeles Unified School District.

Selected List of Persons Who Assisted MALDEF's Scholars-In-Residence

1979-1982

Dean Myron Atkin
Stanford

Dr. Beatriz Arias
Stanford

Robert Blaunner, Ph.D
Associate Professor of Sociology
Department of Sociology
San Diego State University

Dr. Jess Carillo
Farwest Laboratories

Alice Cox
Assistant Vice President
University of California

Celestino Fernandez, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Sociology
Department of Sociology
University of Arizona

Dr. Richard Figueroa
UC, Davis

Dr. Gregg B. Jackson
specialist in research
methods and integrative
research

Dr. Harold Keller
Syracuse University

Dr. Arturo Madrid
National Chicano Council
on Higher Education

Dan McNeill
Harvard Law Student

Dr. Jane Mercer
U.C., Riverside

Dr. Tom Oakland
University of Texas

Dr. Esteban Olmedo
American Psychological Association

Arturo Pacheco
Associate Dean
Stanford

Dr. Amado Padilla
UCLA

Dr. Fernando Penalosa
California State University

Anita Quintanilla
M.S. Sociology,
San Francisco State University

Dr. Daniel Reschly,
Iowa State

Roger Rice
Harvard Center
for Law and Education

Dwight Roper, Ph.D
Independent consultant on
Higher Education Administration

Dr. Bill Sedlacek
University of Maryland

Dr. Richard E. Snow
Stanford

Darlene Tullos
Ph.D. candidate
in education psychology
Stanford University

Dr. Richard Valencia
University of California
Santa Cruz

Dr. Concepcion Valadez
APA/AERA

Dr. Leonard Valverde
University of Texas

E. Belvin Williams
Senior Vice-President
Educational Testing Service

List of Participants

MALDEF's

Minorities & Women's Program
(1979-80)

Dr. Raul Aceves
Dean of Community Programs
Cal State University
Dominguez Hills

David Agosto, Specialist
Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges
Sacramento

Dr. Robert Bailey, Director
Office of Admissions and Records
University of California
Berkeley

Dr. Ernesto J. Ballesteros
Higher Education Research Institute
924 Westwood Blvd., Suite 835
Los Angeles, CA

Professor Bill Banks
Dept. of Afro-American Studies
U.C. Berkeley

Booker Banks, Admissions Office
Office of Admissions
California State University, Sacramento
Sacramento

Dr. Mario Barrera, Chairman
Ethnic Studies Departments
University of California
Berkeley

Dr. Pepe Barron, Executive Director
El Congreso Nacional de Asuntos Colegiales
Washington, D.C.

Dr. David Hayes-Bautista
School of Public Health
University of California
Berkeley

Dr. Robert Blauner
Sociology Department
University of California
Berkeley

Dr. William Boyd, President
A Better Chance, Inc.
Boston, MA

Dr. Sarita Brown
Director of Minority Recruitment
Office of Graduate Studies
University of Texas at Austin

Irma Burks, Director
Leadership Training Program and
the Educational Opportunity Program
Marquette University
Milwaukee, WI

Dr. Albert Camarillo
Department of History
Stanford University
Palo Alto, California

George Cantu, Program Analyst
Office of Student Affairs
University of California
Berkeley

Dr. Raul Cardenas, President
South Mountain Community College
Phoenix, AZ

Dr. Jess Carrillo, Project Representative
STRIDE - General Assistance Center
Far West Laboratory
San Francisco, CA

Arnulfo Casillas, Counselor
(graduate student)
EOPS Program
Glendale College
Glendale, CA

Dr. Maria Chacon, Project Director
Center for Research on Women
Stanford University

Bill Chavez, Program Analyst
Legislative Analyst Office
Sacramento, CA

Vernon Cheadle, Chancellor (former)
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA

Dr. Ray Contreras, Assistant Professor
School of Education
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN

Dr. Wil Counts, Dean of Students
South Mountain Community College

Lawrence Crouchett, EOPS Director
Diablo Valley College
Pleasant Hill, CA

Dr. Natividad De Anda, Program Director
Women & Minorities Leadership Program
Far West Laboratory
San Francisco, CA

Oscar De Haro, EOPS Director
Napa College
Napa, CA

Ron Dyste, Program Director
Educational Opportunity Programs
California Community Colleges
Sacramento, CA

Raul Felix, EOPS Director
Foothill College
Los Altos Hills, CA

Dr. Celestino Fernandez, Assistant Professor
Sociology Department
University of Arizona

Dr. Austin Frank, Director
Student Affairs Research
UC Berkeley

Jim Garnes, Director
Institutional Development
Lincoln University
Jefferson City, MO

Robert Garza, Recruitment Officer
EOP/School Relations
California State College, Stanislaus
Turlock, CA

Manuel Gomez, Associate Director
Office of Relations with Schools
and EOP Admissions
University of California
Irvine, CA

Dr. Andrew Goodrich, Director
Educational Assistance Program
Univ. of Illinois at Chicago Circle

Bruce Hamlett, Higher Education Specialist
Calif. Postsecondary Education Commission
Sacramento, CA

Roberto Haro, Administrative Fellow
Office of the Chancellor
University of California, Berkeley

Michael I. Heyman, Chancellor
University of California, Berkeley

Amiel Jaramillo
Co-Director Legislative Affairs
Student Lobby
University of California

Dr. Robert Kelley, Professor
Department of History
University of California, Santa Barbara

Dr. Mac Laetsch
Vice Chancellor - Student Affairs
UC Berkeley

Dr. Kurt Lauridsen, Director
Student Learning Center
University of California, Berkeley

Dr. Herman Lujan
Vice President for Minority Affairs
University of Washington

Miguel Lopez, Associate Director
Office of Admissions
University of California, Davis

Anita Madrid
Professional Development Program
University of California, Berkeley

Arthur Marmaduke, Director
California Student Aid Commission
Sacramento, CA

Dr. Rudy Marshall, Program Analyst
Legislative Analyst Office
Sacramento, CA

Dr. Juan Martinez, Associate Dean
Graduate Division
University of California, Berkeley

Dan McNeill (graduate student)
School of Law
Harvard University

Pete Michele, Director
EOP Program
San Jose State College
San Jose, CA

Dr. S. Raymond Mireles, Director
EOPS Program
East Los Angeles College
Los Angeles, CA

Dr. Harvey Molotch, Professor
Sociology Department
University of California, Santa Barbara

Paul Monreal (graduate student)
College of Education
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ

Dr. Marco Montoya
Public Health Service
Office of Health Policy
Research, and Statistics
Hyattsville, MD

Dr. Joan Moore, Professor
Sociology Department
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

Fernando de Necochea, Associate Director
Center for Chicano Studies
University of California
Santa Barbara

Luis Nogales, Senior Vice President
Golden West Broadcasters
5858 Sunset Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA

Dr. Michael Olivas, Director of Research
LULAC-National Educational Services Centers
400 First St., N.W. Suite 716
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Esteban Olmedo
American Psychological Association
1200 17th St., N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Mahland Cann-Ortiz (graduate student)
School of Education
UC Berkeley

Dr. Michelle Patterson
1028 Selby Ave.
Los Angeles, CA

Carey Peyton
Associate Dean of Students
California State College, Stanislaus/Turlock CA

Dr. Monte Perez
Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Karl Pister
School of Engineering
UC Berkeley

Dr. Manuel Ramirez, Professor
University of California, Santa Cruz

Dr. Reyes Ramos, Chairman & Associate Professor
Chicano Studies Department
University of Colorado at Boulder

Dr. Rodney Reed, Faculty Assistant for
Affirmative Action
Office of the Chancellor
University of California, Berkeley

Raymond Reyes, Director
EOPS Program
Glendale College
Glendale, CA

Bert Rivas, Associate Dean of Student Affairs
Office of the Chancellor
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, CA

Chancellor Tomas Rivera
UC Riverside

Dr. Eugene Cota-Robles, Professor
University of California, Santa Cruz

Dr. Dan Romero, Management Fellow
Office of Academic Affairs
University of California, Irvine

Dr. Octavio Romano V.
School of Public Health
University of California, Berkeley

Dr. Raul Romero, Lecturer (graduate student)
California State University, Dominguez Hills

Dr. Jaime Salazar, President
Health Research Services
Albuquerque, NM 87109

Dr. Julian Samora, Professor
Dept. of Anthropology and Sociology
Notre Dame University
Notre Dame, IN

Dr. Pat Sanchez, Assistant Vice Chancellor
for Academic Services
University of Colorado at Boulder

Greg Sandoval, Director
Financial Aids/EOPS Program
Southwest College
Chula Vista, CA

Dr. Alfredo G. de los Santos
Vice Chancellor for Educational Development
Maricopa Community Colleges
Phoenix, AZ

Dr. Elizbeth Scott
Department of Statistics
University of California, Berkeley

Dr. Bill Sedlacek, Professor
Counseling Center
University of Maryland
College Park, MD

Dr. Paul Takagi, Associate Professor
School of Education
University of California, Berkeley

Rod Tarrer, Program Officer
EOPS Office - Systemwide
Sacramento, CA

Deanna Tovar, Hispanic Affirmative Action
Officer
Defense Language Institute
Monterey, CA

Darlene Tullos, Ph.D. student
School of Education
Stanford University

Dr. Oscar Uribe
Desegregation Studies Team
National Institute of Education
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Armando Valdez
Bilingual Broadcasting
San Jose, CA

Dr. Leonard Valverde, Director
Office for Advanced Research in
Hispanic Education
University of Texas at Austin

Dr. Arnold Vento, Director
Center for Mexican American Studies
University of Texas at Austin

William Villa, Director
Office of Admissions
University of California, Santa Barbara

Dr. Shelia Walker, Assistant Professor
School of Education
University of California, Berkeley

Dr. Robert Wenkert, Lecturer
School of Education
University of California, Los Angeles

Dr. Homero Yearwood, Chair
Sociology Department
California State University, Sonoma

Conferences, Meetings, Workshops

Dr. Leon also did the following as part of the Minorities and Women's Program:

1) Served as a panelist for the Second National Higher Education Minority Student Workshop held in Atlanta on November 23-26, 1980.

2) Attended the annual meetings of the American Council on Education in San Francisco in October, 1980.

3) Served as the Chairman of the panel on Transfer Experience for the 5th Annual Raza Administrators & Counselors in Higher Education Conference held in Fresno, California, in September, 1980.

4) Delivered a talk on "Minorities at UC Berkeley" at the annual EOP/AA awards luncheon at UC Berkeley in May, 1980.

5) Attended the Southeast Conference on Education of Hispanics held in Miami in May, 1980.

6) Attended the California District Convention of the League of United Latin American Citizens held in Hayward, California, on April 26, 1980.

7) Presented the paper, "The Dream of South Mountain," at the annual meetings of the Pacific Sociological Association in San Francisco in April, 1980.

8) Attended the annual meetings of the American Educational Research Association in Boston in April, 1980.

9) Attended the Leadership Training for Staffs of the Special Programs for Students from Disadvantaged Backgrounds (TRIO) in San Francisco in March, 1980.

10) Served as the Chairman of the panel, "Admissions: Who Do We Admit?" at the Third World/Minority EOP Staff Development Retreat on the UC Berkeley campus in February, 1980.

THE STRUGGLE FOR ACCESS:
MINORITIES IN A CALIFORNIA UNIVERSITY

David Jess Leon

Mexican American Studies Center,
University of Texas Press

1980

Title: The Struggle for Access: Minorities in a California University

Publisher: University of Texas Press

Executive Summary

A number of investigators have studied the minority experience in higher education by examining certain aspects of minority assistance programs, or by describing them in very general terms. But The Struggle for Access: Minorities in a California University is the first detailed sociological case study of such a program ever undertaken. It traces the development of the Education Opportunity Program (EOP) at the University of California at Santa Barbara (UCSB) from its inception in 1966 through years of strife and dramatic confrontation to the stasis that seemed to descend on it in 1975. To clarify and give context to events, the book employs the constructs of crisis mobilization, crisis management, the strategic dilemma of a reform organization, and institutional racism. It also introduces the sociological concept of incipient institutional racism.

Historically, the minority experience in California's system of public education has not been particularly elevating. The schools have, at one time or another, lawfully segregated blacks, Chinese, Japanese, Native Americans, and Chicanos. Discrimination in the lower grades -- along with economic,

cultural, linguistic, and psychological obstacles -- long kept the University of California an essentially all-white bailiwick.

By the mid-60s, however, civil rights activism seemed to have wakened University administrators to the invidious nature of this situation. In 1966, they established an EOP program at UCSB, designed to recruit, admit, and graduate minority students who otherwise would not have attended the institution.

EOP grew slowly at first, like an experiment rather than a commitment. Then, in 1968-9, students dismayed with its pace took over a building and staged an array of demonstrations and rallies, demanding EOP's expansion. The Chancellor responded. He let the program admit more minority students, hired more minority instructors, created departments of ethnic studies, and raised EOP to an administrative echelon high in the hierarchy and close to his ear.

But with the advent of the 70s, the inchmeal waning of the Vietnam War, and the weary collapse of white social concern, EOP's capacity to mount demonstrations diminished. As it did, the Chancellor wrought administrative re-alignments which had the effect of eroding the program's autonomy, influence, and integrity. He maintained that these changes enhanced the efficiency of both EOP and the University, and that EOP clients would not suffer from them. Minorities contended that the reorganizations harmed EOP by their very nature. Tensions

accumulated, and in 1975 found release when students once again occupied a building. By this time, the divisiveness and distrust ran so deep that the Chancellor felt it expedient to call in an outside mediator. This individual effected a compromise, but could do little to change the larger pattern of interaction which had brought on the conflict in the first place.

Three tactical concepts give theoretical structure to the contest: crisis mobilization, crisis management, and the strategic dilemma of a reform organization. Crisis mobilization refers to the creation and maintenance of crises, such as demonstrations and building takeovers, designed to pressure an institution to make changes. It is a technique of the have-nots. Crisis management refers to the administrative attempt to control or mute the crisis potential, through such devices as withholding finances, personnel, cooperation, and/or other resources from rebellious sub-units like EOP at UCSB. It is a technique of the haves. From these two notions emerges the strategic dilemma of a reform organization: by pressing too hard for its goals, it may forfeit those goals entirely.

Institutional racism is a broader, deeper construct. It describes effectively discriminatory policies which have become formalized into the conventional operations of an organization, and hence exist independent of the actors on the scene. It pervades society. At UCSB, for instance, it manifested itself in, among other things, admissions standards which generally

precluded minority enrollment.

But, as commonly understood, institutional racism refers to established phenomena. Much of the struggle at UCSB centered on administrative attempts to impose rules which would, over time, have become institutionally racist in this sense, but were then too much the focus of controversy to carry on any independent existence. Hence, the book introduces the concept of incipient institutional racism -- the process of implementing potentially racist rules -- and examines its stages and possible trajectores.

The Struggle for Access concludes that, although crisis mobilization entails risk of organizational polarization and loss of support, it may be an essential tactic for minority assistance programs if they are going to cope with the pressures of institutional racism successfully. More compliant alternatives have always simply perpetuated the status quo.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Title	Page
1	THE PROBLEM OF ACCESS.....	1
	Introduction.....	3
	Backdrop: The University of California and Minorities.....	5
	History of the University of California.....	6
	History of UCSB.....	14
	The Minority Experience in California Education.....	20
	The Organizational Context.....	30
	Crisis Mobilization.....	31
	Crisis Management.....	33
	The Strategic Dilemma of Reform Organizations.....	35
	Institutional Racism.....	37
2	FROM INCEPTION TO INSURRECTION: 1965-1969.....	1
	The Creation of EOP.....	1
	EOP at Santa Barbara.....	2
	The EOP Experiment.....	3
	Crisis Mobilization: The North Hall "Incident".....	10
	Crisis Maintenance: The United Front	23
3	A CEILING ON AUTONOMY: 1970-1973....	1
	Structural Change: Halving EOP.....	1
	Boom Times: Prosperity for the Moment.....	4
	Accounting: The Invisible Hand.....	7
	The Isla Vista Riots.....	11
	Reaction: Crisis Manipulation.....	13
	The Collapse of Resources.....	20
	Infighting: The Emergence of Strife.	23
	The 30-30-30 Crisis.....	28
4	THE TURNING POINT: 1973-74.....	1
	The Reorganization Proposal.....	1
	The Decline of the Black Component..	5

Chapter		Page
4	The War of Words	8
	Public Release of the Reorganization Plan	17
	The Campbell Hall Meeting: Climax of Crisis	24
	Community Reaction	32
	The Chancellor's Response	34
	The Resignation of the Executive Vice Chancellor	35
	The Firing of the Black Associate Director of EOP	37
	Countdown	39
5	TAKEOVER AND MEDIATION, 1974-75	1
	Lawsuit	1
	The Black Studies Center Crisis	5
	The Second Computer Take-Over	8
	The Communications Committee	11
	The Consequences for EOP: 1975-80	24
6	EOP AND THE FUTURE OF MINORITIES	1
	The EOP Accomplishment at UCSB	1
	Institutional Racism and Minority Access	5
	The Society	5
	Public Education	7
	The University	8
	UC Santa Barbara	11
	Incipient Institutional Racism	16
	The Excellence Defense	21
	Bureaucratic Aspects	22
	Meritocratic Aspects	25
	Remedies	32
	The Future of the University of California	36
	Budget Cutbacks	36
	Demographic Changes	38
	APPENDICES	A-1
	Research Methods	A-1
	FBI Report	B-1
	REFERENCES	R-1

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2-1	EOP Students at UCSB, 1965-68	2- 8
2-2	EOP Students at UCSB, 1965-69	2-11
3-1	EOP at UCSB, 1967-70	3- 6
3-2	EOP Students at UCSB	3-15
3-3	Racial Composition of EOP Students	3-16
3-4	EOP Students at UCSB, 1968-72	3-22
3-5	Racial Composition of EOP Students	3-24
3-6	EOP Students at UCSB	3-29
3-7	Racial Composition of EOP Students	3-30
4-1	Racial and Ethnic Breakdown of EOP Students, 1971-74	4- 7
5-1	EOP Students at UCSB	5-24
5-2	University of California Domestic Student Enrollment, 1975-79	5-25

LIST OF DIAGRAMS

Diagram		Page
2-A	Educational Opportunity Program 1968-69	2-22
2-B	Educational Opportunity Program 1969-70	2-28
3-A	Organizational Changes in EOP's Authority Structure 1971-72	3-18

REFERENCES

Admissions & Outreach Services Report
1980 "CPEC Request for Descriptive Information about the University's Undergraduate Student Affirmative Action Outreach Efforts." Berkeley, CA: University of California.

Anderson, Edward
1978 "A Retention Design applied to an Equal Opportunity Program." New Directions for Student Services: 37-46.

Auslander, Vivian
1980 Faculty Involvement in Student Affirmative Action. Report to the Chair of the Academic Council, University of California.

Barrera, Mario
1979 Race and Class in the Southwest. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.

Becker, Howard
1958 "Problems of Inference and Proof in Participant Observation." American Sociological Review 23 (December): 652-659.

Bendix, R.
1956 Work and Authority in Industry. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Benokraitis, Nijole and Joe Feagin
1974 "Institutional Racism." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association. Montreal, Canada.

Blauner, Robert
1972 Racial Oppression in America. New York: Harper & Row.

Brown, George, Nan Rosen, Susan Hill, Michael Olivas
1980 The Condition of Education for Hispanics. Washington,D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics.

Camarillo, Alberto
1979 Chicanos in a Changing Society. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Carter, Thomas and Roberto Segura
1979 Mexican Americans in School. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Cicourel, Aaron
1964 Methods and Measurement in Sociology. New York: Free Press.

Corwin, Ronald
1973 Reform and Organizational Survival: Teacher Corps. New York: Wiley-Interscience.

Cox, Alice
1980 Report to High Schools and Community Colleges about the Academic Performance of their Students in the University. Office of the President, University of California.

Cyert, Richard and James March
1963 A Behavioral Theory of the Firm. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Davidson, Matthew
1979 "Affirmative Action's Second Generation: In the Matter of Vilma Hernandez." Change (November/December): 42-46.

Denzin, Norman
1970 The Research Act. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

1970 Sociological Methods. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

Egerton, John
1969 State Universities and Black Americans. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Education Foundation.

Flacks, Richard and Milton Mankoff
1970 "Revolt in Santa Barbara: Why They Burned the Bank." Nation (March 28).

Fleming, John, Gerald Gill, David Swinton
1978 The Case of Affirmative Action for Blacks in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press.

Forbes, Jack
1970 "EOP Office as Colonialist Bureaucracy Agency." Third World News, October 5.

Gottsdanker, Josephine
1973 Characteristics of UCSB Students. Unpublished Report. University of California, Santa Barbara.

Hendrick, Irving
1977 The Education of Non-Whites in California, 1849-1970. San Francisco, CA: R & E Research Associates, Inc.

BLANK PAGE
DO NOT FILM

Hill, Robert
1978 The Illusion of Black Progress. Washington, D.C.: National Urban League.

Jeffery, Kate
1980 Memo to John Woods. Office of Student Academic Services (May 13). University of California.

Jones, James M.
1972 Prejudice and Racism. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Kammen, Michael (editor)
1980 The Past Before Us. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Kanter, Rosabeth
1977 "Some Effects of Proportions on Group Life: Skewed Sex Ratios and Responses to Token Women." American Journal of Sociology 82 (March): 965-990.

Kelley, Robert
1980 Transformations: The Santa Barbara Campus of the University of California, 1944-1980. Unpublished manuscript.

Klingelhofer, E. and Brenda Longacre
1972 "Educational Opportunity Programs." The Research Reporter 7: 5-8.

Leon, David Jess
1975 "Chicano College Dropouts and the Educational Opportunity Program: Failure After High School?" High School Behavioral Science 3 (Fall): 6-11.

Molotch, Harvey
1970 "Oil in Santa Barbara and Power in America." Sociological Inquiry 40 (Winter): 131-144.

Nelson, Bryce
1969 "Brandeis: How a Liberal University reacts to a Black Take-Over." Science 163 (3874): 1431-1434.

Perrow, Charles
1972 Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay. Glencoe, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Piven, Frances and Richard Cloward
1971 Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare. New York: Vintage Books.

1974 The Politics of Turmoil. New York: Pantheon.

1979 Poor People's Movements. New York: Vintage Books.

Rockefeller Foundation
1979 Bakke, Weber, and Affirmative Action. New York.

Rogers, David
1969 110 Livingston Street. New York: Vintage Books.

Ryan, William
1971 Blaming the Victim. New York: Pantheon.

Sale, Roger
1976 Seattle: Past to Present. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Salinas, Guadalupe
1971 "Mexican Americans and the Desegregation of Schools in the Southwest." Houston Law Review 8: 929-951.

Spangler, Eve, Marsha Gordon, Ronald Pipkin
1978 "Token Women: An Empirical Test of Kanter's Hypothesis." American Journal of Sociology 84 (July): 160-170.

Stadtman, Verne
1970 The University of California, 1868-1968. New York: McGraw-Hill.

United States Commission on Civil Rights
1979 Toward an Understanding of Bakke. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

University of California Joint Planning Committee
1979 The University of California: A Multi-Campus System in the 1980's. Berkeley, CA: University of California.

University of California, Berkeley
1979 Report of the Academic Senate Committee on Women and Ethnic Minorities.

Webb, Eugene
1966 "Unconventionality, Triangulation and Inference," in the Proceedings of the 1966 Invitational Conference on Testing Problems, pp. 34-43. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service.

Weber, Max
1947 The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. New York: Free Press.

Wellman, David
1977 Portraits of White Racism. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wiseman, Jacqueline and Marcia Aron
1970 Field Projects for Sociology Students. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Company.

Whyte, William
1943 Street Corner Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wollenberg, Charles
1978 All Deliberate Speed: Segregation and Exclusion in California's Schools, 1855-1975. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Mexican American
Legal Defense
and Educational Fund

1636 West Eighth Street
Suite 319
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 383-6952

Appendix D

MALDEF

DRAFT

The Mexican American Legal Defense & Educational Fund (MALDEF) Report on the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD): A Comparison of School Finance and Facilities Between Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Schools during Fiscal Year 1980-81

Dr. Ruben W. Espinosa,
Principal Investigator & Research Director

John E. Huerta
Associate Counsel

October, 1982

Los Angeles, California

Report on the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD):

A Comparison of School Finance and Facilities
Between Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Schools
during Fiscal Year 1980-1981

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Why This Study?

This study was really launched by parents--Hispanic parents who, over the years, have complained bitterly that their children are being relegated to overcrowded, rundown, inferior schools. Outraged by the conditions their youngsters face, Hispanics in Los Angeles charge that their children are not getting an equal and decent education.

This study turns those charges into hard fact.

It reveals that the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) is spending 40 percent less on Hispanic grade school students than on white children. Highly-Hispanic schools are heavily overcrowded while mostly-white schools are underused. Perhaps most shocking of all, the LAUSD is spending far more on children from wealthy households than on students from poor homes.

Hispanics form over 45 percent of students in the LAUSD. Most of those students face ghetto school environments and sub-standard educational services.

The Study Methodology

The study was conducted by Dr. Ruben W. Espinosa, a national expert in the school finance field. Formerly Director of Research for the California School Finance Reform Project, Dr. Espinosa has pursued graduate and post-graduate studies at Stanford and Columbia Universities.

This comparative study of Hispanic and non-Hispanic schools is based on data supplied by the LAUSD. A 20 percent random sample was selected from LAUSD elementary and junior high schools. Schools with the highest concentrations of Hispanic, white and black students were selected for comparison to each other (stratified schools). Another category of Hispanic elementary overutilized schools (67 percent to 94 percent Hispanic) was also selected for study. DAta on per-pupil and per-school expenditures were analyzed for the 1980-1981 fiscal year.

Major Findings

1. School Spending

The LAUSD spend about $500 less per-pupil in Hispanic elementary schools and almost $560 less per-pupil in Hispanic junior high schools than it does in white schools.

When funds for remedial, bilingual and other special programs (categorical funds) are subtracted from school expenditures, this wide gap grows into a shocking abyss. Minus categorical funds, the LAUSD is spending $816 less on Hispanic elementary school students and $732 less on Hispanic junior high students than it is on whites.

2. Poverty

Data show that the LAUSD actually spends less per-pupil on schools attended by poor students than on schools attended by students from wealthier families, once categorical funds are subtracted from school expenses. Analysis of the random sample shows that, the greater the poverty level in a school, the less basic state education money each pupil gets (negative correlation r=.43). On the average, highly Hispanic schools have a 222 percent higher incidence of poverty than white schools.

3. Elementary School Size

A major reason for the disparity in expenditures is school size. The white stratified schools in our study averaged 294 students per school. Hispanic stratified schools averaged 1,076 students per school. Hispanic overutilized schools averaged 1,363 students per school--making them 383 percent larger than the white stratified schools.

4. Student Achievement

While a direct cause and effect relationship cannot be claimed between school spending, school size and student achievement, this study shows a strong correlation between those factors in the LAUSD. That is, the higher the per-pupil spending in a school, the smaller school enrollment and the greater student achievement. LAUSD data show that third grade reading achievement in Hispanic elementary schools is 25 points below white schools and 11 points below the district average.

5. Data Trends

Analysis of the random sample shows that, as schools grow in percentage of Hispanic students, the number of student enrollment increases, school spending goes down and

so does academic achievement. The opposite is also true: As schools increase in percentage of white schools, school enrollment goes down, school spending increases and so does academic achievement.

6. Overcrowding of Hispanic Schools

Comparing objectively measurable variables, Hispanic schools are greatly overcrowded compared with white schools and provide a lower quality school environment.

A. Acreage

Hispanic schools have 28 percent less acreage than white schools--even though they have 266 percent more students.

B. Air Conditioned Classrooms

On the average, highly-Hispanic schools have 46 percent fewer students in permanent classrooms with air-conditioning than white schools. Mobile classroom units in Hispanic schools have 525 percent fewer air conditioned rooms than those in white schools.

C. Playground Space

Hispanic schools have 581 percent less playground space per pupil.

D. Educational Facility Space

Hispanic schools have 22 percent less classroom space; 250 percent less auditorium space; 228 percent less cafeteria space; 185 percent less multipurpose space; 482 percent less landscaping; 3200 percent less garden space and 241 percent less restroom space per pupil than do white schools in the LAUSD.

E. Site Capacity

Hispanic schools were planned to have 517 more pupils, on the average, than white schools (192 percent avariance). In fact, white schools ended up serving far fewer students than planned. Hispanic schools ended up serving far more than planned.

Conclusions

The first and major conclusion is that the district must equalize per-pupil, basic state and district funding immediately. It is recommended that a concrete plan be

developed to relieve overcrowding in highly-Hispanic schools. Also, the state government must strengthen its efforts to end discriminatory treatment of Hispanic students. Finally, it is recommended that the state legislature consider breaking up the LAUSD and other school districts in Los Angeles County to create new districts with equal educational facilities.

It is recommended that the following specific course of action be taken:

1. Equal School Funding

A fiscal budget for the 1983-1984 school year should be created providing nearly-equal per-pupil spending of non-categorical funds within the district. Exact equality in spending, of course, is impossible but we recommend that dollar amounts vary no more than 5 percent or $100 per pupil per school.

2. School Closure

We recommend that small, inefficient and underused schools in the district be closed. According to the Little Hoover Commission, $18 million could be saved by this action. The dollars saved could be spent to lease added school facilities to relieve overcrowded institutions. These combined strategies could equalize funding between schools in the district.

3. Regrouping Districts

The state legislature should closely examine the Report of the Evaluation and Training Institute of May 15, 1982, to the Office of the Legislative Analyst. We support that report's recommendation of regrouping all schools in Los Angeles County into new districts. Such regrouping should be designed to relieve overcrowding, enhance school desegregation, assure equal spending per pupil and guarantee community control of schools.

4. State Enforcement of Non-Discrimination Laws

It is recommended that the State Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights Compliance immediately investigate the LAUSD to determine how long money has been disproportionately spend on wealthier schools. We ask that the office take appropriate action to bring LAUSD into compliance. We recommend that the State Department of Education investigate possible violations of the civil rights of Hispanic students by the LAUSD and that the department monitor LAUSD implementation of state and federal non-discrimination requirements.

1. The results show that Los Angeles Unified School District does not deliver equivalent school services and construction space to Hispanic sites when compared to the rest of the student body.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

2. SCHOOL SIZE

The White stratified schools (n=33) had an average school size of 294. The Hispanic stratified schools (n=31) had an average school size of 1076. The average for the district was 632 (n=86) based on a 20 percent random sample. On the average the Hispanic elementary schools were 266 percent larger than White schools. The Hispanic overutilized elementary schools (n=32) were 363 percent larger.

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

3. SCHOOL SIZE

The White stratified schools (n=8) had an average school size of 894. The Hispanic stratified schools (n=12) had an average school size of 1944. The average for the district was 1471 (n=15) based on a 20 percent random sample. On the average the Hispanic Junior High Schools were 117 percent larger than White schools.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

4. TOTAL CURRENT EXPENDITURES$_1$

The White stratified schools (n=33) had average total expenditures$_1$ per pupil of $2249. The Hispanic stratified schools (n=31) had average total expenditures$_1$of $1749. The average for the district was 1939 (n=86) based on a 20 percent random sample. On the average the Hispanic elementary schools spent $500 dollars per pupil less or 22 percent less than White schools.

5. TOTAL CURRENT EXPENDITURES$_2$

The White Stratified schools (n=33) had average total expenditures$_2$ per pupil of $2224. The Hispanic stratified schools (n=31) had average total expenditures$_2$of $1706. The average for the district was 1913 (n=86) based on a 20 percent random sample. On the average the Hispanic elementary schools spent $518 dollars per pupil less or 23 percent less than White schools.

6. TOTAL CURRENT EXPENDITURES$_3$

The White stratified schools (n=33) had average expenditures$_3$ of 2171. The Hispanic stratified schools (n=31) had average expenditures$_3$ of 1355. The average for the district was 1718 (n=86) based on a 20 percent random sample. On the average the Hispanic elementary schools spent 38 percent less or 816 dollars less per pupil than White schools.

1 All sources of funding
2 All sources of funding minus captial outlay
3 All sources of funding minus categorical funds

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

7. TOTAL CURRENT EXPENDITURES$_1$

The White stratified schools (n=8) had average total expenditures$_1$ per pupil of $2560. The Hispanic stratified schools (n=12) had average total expenditures$_1$ of $2001. The average for the district was $2248.(n=15) based on a 20 percent random sample. On the average the Hispanic Junior High schools spent $559. dollars per pupil less or 22 percent less than White schools.

8. TOTAL CURRENT EXPENDITURES$_2$

The White Stratified schools (n=8) had average total expenditures$_2$ per pupil of $2538. The Hispanic stratified schools (n=12) had average total expenditures$_2$ of $1976. The average for the district was $2210. based on a 20 percent random sample. On the average the Hispanic Junior High schools spent $562. dollars per pupil less or 22 percent less than White schools.

9. TOTAL CURRENT EXPENDITURES$_3$

The White stratified schools (n=8) had average expenditures$_3$ of 2513. The Hispanic stratified schools (n=12) had average expenditures of 1781. The average for the district was $2047. based on a 20 percent random sample. On the average the Hispanic Junior High schools spent 29 percent less or $732. dollars less per pupil than White schools.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

10. STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

The White stratified schools (n=33) had average reading achievement 3rd grade scores of 78. The Hispanic stratified schools (n=31) had average achievement scores of 53. The average for the district was 64 (n=86) based on a 20 percent random sample. On the average the Hispanic elementary schools were on the average 25 points below the White schools.

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

11. STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

The White stratified schools (n=8) had average reading achievement 8th grade scores of 49. The Hispanic stratified schools (n=12) had average achievement scores of 32. The average for the district was 35 (n=86) based on a random sample (n=15). On the average the Hispanic elementary schools were on the average 17 points below the White schools.

1 All sources of funding
2 All sources of funding minus captial outlay
3 All sources of funding minus categorical funds

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

12. SITE CAPACITY FOR CONSTRUCTION PURPOSES

The White stratified schools (n=33) had an average projected school capacity of 562. The Hispanic stratified schools (n=31) had projected school capacity of 1079. The average for the two stratified samples was 812 (n=64). On the average the Hispanic elementary schools were projected with 192 percent more capapcity or 517 pupils greater than White schools.

13. CLASSROOM SPACE

The White stratified schools had 14.7 pupils per classroom. The Hispanics had 28.02 pupils per classroom. The White sample had enough permanent classrooms to seat 100 percent of the pupils from the White sample. Hispanic schools had enough permanent classrooms to seat 78 percent of the pupils from the Hispanic sample.

14. EXTRA CLASSROOM SPACE

The White sample had 9.5 classrooms per site of extra space (assuming 28 pupils per class). The Hispanic stratified schools had no extra classrooms.

15. PORTABLE CLASSROOMS

The White sample (n=33) had 3.4 portable classrooms per site. The Hispanic schools (n=31) had 8.3 portable classrooms per site. Hispanic schools had 59 percent more portable classrooms.

16. PERMANENT CLASSROOMS WITH AIR CONDITIONING

The White sample had 56 percent of the pupils in permanent classrooms with air conditioning. The Hispanic sample had 26 percent of the pupils in permanent classrooms. Hispanic schools has 30 percent less pupils on the average in permanent classrooms with air conditioning.

17. PORTABLE CLASSROOMS WITH AIR CONDITIONING

Twenty five percent of the portable classrooms at the White sites (n=33) had air conditioning. Four percent of the portable classrooms at the Hispanic sites had air conditioning. Hispanic sites had 525 percent fewer portables with air conditioning.

18. LIBRARY SPACE

The White schools had 4.2 square feet of library space per pupil (n=33). The Hispanic schools had 1.2 square feet of library space per pupil (n=31). Hispanic schools had 250 percent less library space.

19. AUDITORIUM SPACE

The White schools had 34.1 square feet of auditorium space per pupil(n=33). The Hispanic schools had 6.1 square feet of auditorium space per pupil (n=31). Hispanic schools had 459 percent less auditorium space.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

19. AUDITORIUM SPACE

The White schools had 34.1 square feet of auditorium space per pupil(n=33). The Hispanic schools had 6.1 square feet of auditorium space per pupil (n=31). Hispanic schools had 459 percent less auditorium space per pupil.

20. CAFETERIA SPACE

The White schools had 16.4 square feet of cafeteria space per pupil(n=33). The Hispanic schools had 5.0 square feet of cafeteria space per pupil (n=31). Hispanic schools had 228 percent less cafeteria space per pupil.

21. MULTIPURPOSE SPACE

The White schools had 20.6 square feet of cafeteria space per pupil (n=33). The Hispanic schools had 7.8 square feet of multipurpose space per pupil (n=31). Hispanic schools had 185 percent less multipurpose space per pupil.

22. PLAYGROUND SPACE

The White schools had 722 square feet of playground space per pupil (n=33). The Hispanic schools had 106 square feet of playground space per pupil (n=31). Hispanic schools had 581 percent less playground space per pupil.

23. LANDSCAPING SPACE

The White schools had 99 square feet of landscaping space per pupil (n=33). The Hispanic schools had 17 square feet of landscaping space per pupil (n=31). Hispanic schools had 482 percent less landscaping space per pupil.

24. GARDEN SPACE

The White schools had 3.3 square feet of garden space per pupil (n=33). The Hispanic schools had one-tenth of one percent of garden space per pupil (n=31). Hispanic schools had 3200 percent less garden space per pupil.

25. RESTROOM SPACE

The White schools had 5.8 square feet of restroom space per pupil (n=33). The Hispanic schools had 1.7 square feet of garden space per pupil (n=31). Hispanic schools had 241 percent less restroom space per pupil.

Data Trends (weighted correlational results of random samples)

The same basic trends are true form both the elementary and Junior high samples.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

SCHOOL SIZE

1. School size increases as percent Hispanic students increase, the correlation is r= .62 significant at the .001 level.

   School size decreases as percent White students increase, the correlation is r= -.58 significant at the .001 level.

TOTAL EXPENDITURES$_1$

2. As percent Hispanic increases school expenditures$_1$ per pupil decrease, the correlation is r= -.38 significant at the .001 level.

   As percent White increases school expenditures$_1$ per pupil increase, the correlation is r= .13 significant at the .001 level.

TOTAL EXPENDITURES$_2$

3. As percent Hispanic increases school expenditures$_2$ per pupil decrease, the correlation is r= -.31 significant at the .001 level.

   For the White sample on this measure of total expenditures$_2$ there is no clear direction with the correlation r= .08.

TOTAL EXPENDITURES$_3$

4. As percent Hispanic increases school expenditures$_3$ per pupil decrease, the correlation is r= -.43 significant at the .001 level.

   As percent White increases school expenditures$_3$ per pupil increase, the correlation is r= .47 significant at the .001 level.

READING ACHIEVEMENT THIRD GRADE

5. As percent Hispanic students increase, school reading achievement for the third grade decrease, the correlation is r= -.38 significant at the .001 level.

   As percent White increase school reading achievement for the third grade increases, the correlation is r= .60 significant at the .001 level.

1 All sources of funding
2 All sources of funding minus capital outlay
3 All sources of funding minus categorical funds

LIST OF TABLES

Tables		Page
1	Hispanic Stratified Sample Compared with White Stratified Sample On Major Variables For Elementary Schools 1980-81.....	
2	Hispanic Stratified Sample Compared with White Stratified Sample On Major Variables For Junior High Schools 1980-81.....	
3	Hispanic Overutilized Sample Compared with White Stratified Sample On Major Variables For Elementary Schools 1980-81.....	
4	Hispanic Stratified Sample Compared With White Stratified Sample on Major Variables For Elementary Schools 1980-81.....	
5	Correlation Matix of Major Variables Los Angeles Unified School District 1980 Elementary Schools.....	
6	Correlation Matrix of Major Variables Los Angeles Unified School District 1980 Junior High Schools.....	
7	Scattergram of Percent Hispanic with Average Daily Attendance 1980 Elementary Schools.....	
8	Scattergram of Percent White with Average Daily Attendance 1980 Elementary Schools.....	
9	Scattergram of Percent White with Average Total Expenditures Minus Categorical Elementary Schools.....	
10	Scattergram of Percent Hispanic with Average Total Expenditures Minus Categorical Elementary Schools.....	
11	Scattergram of Percent White with Median Reading Scores Elementary Schools.....	
12	Scattergram of Percent Hispanic with Median Reading Scores Elementary Schools.....	
13	Scattergram of Percent White with Average Daily Attendance Junior High Schools.....	
14	Scattergram of Percent Hispanic with Average Daily Attendance Junior High Schools.....	
15	Scattergram of Percent White with Total Current Expenditures Minus Categorical Junior High Schools...	
16	Scattergram of Percent Hispanic with Total Current Expenditures Minus Categorical Junior High Schools...	

APPENDICES

Appendix		Page
A	Elementary and Junior High Sample by Area Code and Stratified Sample.....	
B	Raw Data for Average Daily Attendance and School Expenditures by Major Category of Expenses for Elementary and Junior High Schools.....	
C	Operational Definitions for Schools Expenditures as Written by Los Angeles Unified School District Controller's Report.....	
D	Sources and Examples of the Operational Measures used for Categorical Funding.....	
E	Sources and Examples of the Operational Measures used for Ethnicity.....	
F	Sources and Examples of the Operational Measures Used for Test Data.....	
G	Sources and Examples of the Operational Measures used on Major Variables.....	
H	List of Major Raw Data Sources Available From the Los Angeles Unified School District.....	

APPENDIX H

MAJOR DATA SOURCES

1. Los Angeles Unified School District
   Controller's Annual Report of Expenditures Classified by Schools
   for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1981
   Prepared by General Accounting Branch,
   Controlling Div. December 28, 1981
2. Racial and Ethnic Survey
   Fall 1980
   Publication No. 390
   Research and Evaluation Branch
   Los Angeles Unified School District
3. Report on the District Testing Programs 1980-81
   Publication No. 403
   Research and Evaluation Branch
   Los Angeles Unified School District
4. District Consolidated Application for Fund
   for Educational Programs
   Program Year 1980-81
   California State Department of Education
   Form A-127 0 (Rev. 4-80)
5. Acreage Report, Prepared by LAUSD.
6. Capacity Report, Prepared by LAUSD.
7. Permanent Classrooms, "Pupil Capacity-Elementary Schools,"
   available at School Building Planning Division.
8. Portable Classrooms, "Special Administration and Miscellaneous"
   School Planning Division. Also, "Portable Buildings with Afr
   Condition".
9. "Housing Inventory System (H.I.S.) Master Set Room Report, School
   Planning Division. This report has data on the following
   variables: Library Space
   Auditorium Space
   Multi-purpose Space
   Cafeteria Space
   Sanitary Facilities
10. "Housing Inventory System", "Portable Buildings with Air Condition",
    and "Air Conditioned Buildings- Year Round Schools". Building
    Planning Division. These reports have data on Air Conditioned Rooms.
11. Files at Business Division-Maintenance and Operations Branch, 1500
    E. 14th street. This report has data on Playground Acreage and
    Garden Acreage.
12. Library Services, Librarian Cataloging and Processing.
    Number of Library Books.

Other Sources

-Cafeteria Site Report for 1982
-Auditorium Report
-Current Backlog of Major Maintenance Needs

These reports are available at the Schools building Planning Division at LAUSD.

Mexican American
Legal Defense
and Educational Fund

28 Geary Street
San Francisco, CA 94108
(415) 981-5800

Appendix E

MALDEF

Statement by the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund before the Assembly Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, October, 1981

M. Susana Navarro, Ph.D.
Ronald T. Vera, Esq.
Access to Higher
Education Project

National Office
28 Geary Street
San Francisco, CA 94108
(415) 981-5800

Regional Offices
343 South Dearborn Street
Suite 910
Chicago, IL 60604
(312) 427-9363

250 W. Fourteenth Avenue
Suite 308
Denver, CO 80204
(303) 893-1693

1636 West Eighth Street
Suite 319
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 383-6952

517 Petroleum Commerce Bldg
201 North St. Mary's Street
San Antonio, TX 78205
(512) 224-5476

1411 K Street, NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 393-5111

Contributions Are Deductible for US Income Tax Purposes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

The Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF) is a national, civil rights organization dedicated to ensuring the civil rights of Americans of Hispanic descent. With offices in San Francisco, Washington, D.C., Los Angeles, San Antonio, Chicago, and Denver, MALDEF has for over a decade devoted itself to guaranteeing constitutional rights in the areas of education, employment, voting rights, and immigration. In particular, MALDEF's Access to Higher Education Project, funded by the Ford Foundation, has been involved for the past two years in research and litigation in the area of Hispanic access to higher education.

In this statement, we will summarize the status of Hispanics in higher education, review the concept of affirmative action, discuss some of the arguments against affirmative action raised by opponents, and finally, make recommendations for strengthening the state's committment to providing equal opportunity for minorities and women in higher education.

The Status of Hispanics in Higher Education

In setting the framework for a discussion of equal educational opportunity, the history and current status of Hispanics in education must be reviewed. It is that history, with exclusion and denial of educational services at its core, that provides part of the rationale for affirmative action.

The status of Hispanics in higher education as students, staff, and faculty, results from discriminatory public

policies in higher education, as well as from practices and policies at the elementary and secondary school levels. The barriers to education at the elementary and secondary levels foretell the low Hispanic participation in higher education.

Prior to the 1950's, Hispanics were either denied admission to public schools, or were provided separate and distinctly unequal educational services. Numerous educational policies in states and localities mandated that Chicanos attend "Mexican" schools only.[1] Some districts responded to such mandates by failing to establish special schools, thus effectively barring Chicanos from the educational process. Other districts responded by establishing schools grossly understaffed and underequipped, provided with old, out-dated books and materials, and often housed in decrepit structures.

Even this low level of educational services was often provided only for the first years of elementary school.[2] Effects of such limited educational opportunities are evident in the large percentage of Mexican Americans with less than five years of schooling. In 1978, for Chicanos 45-64 years of age, approximately one-third received less than five years of schooling, while for those 65 years of age and over that figure increases to two-thirds.[3]

While outright exclusion of Hispanics was less prevalent at the secondary school level (it was virtually unnecessary as few reached that level), Chicanos had to overcome other problems in attempting to gain a high school diploma. These included, among others, the lack

of schools in or close to their neighborhoods, isolation from their peers, and denigration of their language and culture.[4] Not surprisingly, the percentage of Chicanos who have not completed high school is exceedingly high. The proportion failing to complete high school decreases by age group, from 93 percent for those 65 years and over to 50 percent for those 25-29 years of age.[5] This yields a very high and disturbing average of 66 percent of all Chicanos over 25 years who have not completed high school.[6]

College attendance by Hispanics prior to the 1950's was almost non-existent. During the 1950s and 60s, as more Hispanics graduated from high school, college attendance increased slightly.[7] But it was not until the late 1960s that college enrollment by Hispanics increased substantially, due largely to special recruitment and admissions policies established by many colleges and universities that had traditionally excluded minority students.[8] Still, such policies resulted in Hispanics making up only two percent of all full-time students in institutions of higher education in 1970.[9] Similarly, Hispanics in 1970 made up only 1.2 percent of all students in graduate and first professional programs.[10] By 1978, those figures and increased only slightly to 3.5 percent of undergraduates and 2.2 percent of graduate and professional school students. In California, Hispanic undergraduate enrollment went from 9 percent in 1976 to 10 percent in 1978.[11] Graduate enrollment went from 4.7 to 5.0 percent. These California data represent figures for all enrollees, rather than full-time students, of which Chicanos represent a smaller proportion.[12]

While these upward trends appear encouraging, several factors reduce optimism about change in Hispanic higher education enrollment. First, Hispanics make up 6.4 percent of the total U.S. population and almost 20 percent of the California population.[13] Hispanics, thus, are represented in higher education at one-half the rate, or less, of their representation in the general population. The underrepresentation is even more dramatic because the Hispanic population tends to be younger on average than the overall U.S. population and Hispanics make up a larger proportion of the college age group.[14] As the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) noted in its comprehensive report on minorities and equal educational opportunity: "Viewed against the backdrop of the growth in the state's Chicano population, the picture of overall progress [in student enrollment levels] is illusory."[15]

A second consideration in assessing Hispanic gains in higher education is that data reflect gross enrollment figures, obscuring the fact that Hispanics tend to enroll in disproportionately high numbers at two year institutions, tend to transfer less to four year institutions, and have higher attrition rates at all levels.[16] In California, as of 1978, over 80% of all Hispanic undergraduates were in two year colleges.[17] Moreover, in four year institutions, Hispanics in California were much more likely to be enrolled at a CSUC campus than at a UC campus.[18]

Finally, increases in enrollment figures represent the results of efforts by institutions of higher education, government agencies, private foundations, and others

to redress the effects of part discrimination. Many of the recruitment, admissions, and scholarship/fellowship programs which resulted from those efforts, however, have either come under attack, or have lost institutional support, and have been discontinued or reduced in scope and funding. It is open to question whether the small gains of the recent past will be maintained or will fade if special efforts are discontinued.

Of particular importance in discussing affirmative action in higher education employment is the proportion of doctoral degrees awarded to Hispanics. Affirmative action in higher education is contingent upon the availability of qualified candidates for teaching positions and, in general, a prerequisite is the doctoral degree. Prior to 1970, few Hispanics reached graduate school and thus the number receiving doctoral degrees was almost non-existent.[19] By 1974, Hispanics received less than one percent of all doctorates awarded and that figure had risen only to 1.6 percent by 1977.[20]

The increase in doctoral degrees received by Hispanics from 1974 to 1977 suggests a trend which may ultimately produce a large pool of qualified Hispanics available for faculty employment. Recent data on numbers of Hispanics in graduate programs, however, indicate the opposite. There has been a small but steady and continuing drop in Hispanic graduate enrollment, warning of a reversal in the trend to more Hispanic Ph.D.s.[21]

Hispanics in Higher Education Employment

The participation of Hispanics in higher education employment, in terms of numbers and status, remains

extremely low. Hispanics made up only 1.5 percent of all faculty members in institutions of higher education in 1977 and again in 1979.[22] They made up a greater proportion of the non-tenured faculty than of the tenured faculty. In contrast to their Anglo colleagues, tenured Hispanics were much less likely to hold the rank of professor and much more likely to hold the rank of instructor.

In 1979, Hispanics in California comprised 3.7 percent of faculty at all levels in public colleges and universities, but unlike their white counterparts, they were much more likely to be non-tenured. Even within the tenured ranks they were concentrated at the lowest levels. They made up only 1.3 percent of tenured professors, at the same time they comprised almost 4.4 percent of tenured instructors.[23]

Some of these data, which appear encouraging at first glance, are misleading. The California State University and College System data, indicating that 3.2 percent of faculty are Hispanic, obscure the fact that only 1.9 percent are tenured and the rest are non-tenured. Similarly, the statistic indicating that 3.7 percent of all California public higher education faculty are Hispanic fails to reveal that they are overwhelmingly and disproportionately found in junior colleges.[24]

Hispanics are similarly underrepresented in other professional higher education positions. They comprise only 1.4 percent of those in executive administrative and managerial positions and 1.8 percent of other professional non-faculty positions.[25] In California,

Hispanics do slightly better in obtaining professional positions than faculty positions. They hold 4.1 percent of executive administrative and managerial positions, but as with faculty positions, they hold proportionately far fewer jobs in the US and CSUC systems than in the Community College system.[26] Similarly, they hold 4.3 percent of other professional, non-faculty positions, of which UCs proportion is approximately one-half that at CSUC and one-third that in the Community College system.[27]

This brief overview of students and faculty in higher education clarifies the critical need to increase the number of Hispanics in colleges and universities, particularly in employment positions. Clearly, in order to increase the pool of those holding doctoral degrees, there must be increases in the number accepted and supported through graduate study, which in turn is dependent on enrollment and successful completion of undergraduate programs, which rests finally on attaining a high school diploma after elementary and secondary school. Rank and tenure status are clearly of importance for it is often only from stable, higher level positions that faculty and other professional staff can become integral and influential parts of their institutions. Moreover, it is individuals in higher level faculty positions, as well as in executive and other professional nonfaculty positions, that can most effectively assist Hispanic students in higher education by providing informed and understanding support and counsel, assistance in gaining needed academic, research and employment opportunities, guidance through the maze of

university services and resources, and finally by acting as successful academic models.

We thus now turn to a review of the pros and cons of affirmative action, and some of the affirmative action practices that have proven most successful in overcoming underrepresentation in employment among minorities and women.

Affirmative Action in Higher Education

The term affirmative action has been assigned numerous different meanings by persons and agencies and, as a consequence, is widely misunderstood. We, therefore, will clarify our understanding and use of the term.

Affirmative action refers to those efforts and procedures that are designed to remedy the problem of underrepresentation and discrimination faced by minorities and women in employment. It involves the undertaking of positive, aggressive efforts in the design and implementation of employee selection procedures so as to insure that minorities and women participate in representative numbers in all types of employment. These measures entail more than merely assembling a representative application pool; they involve active consideration of race or sex as a positive factor in employment decisions. The ultimate goal of affirmative action is the employment of minorities and women in all areas and at all levels in numbers representative of their make-up in the general population.

In the area of higher education, affirmative action

requires the revision of standards and practices to assure that colleges and universities are yielding a work force representative of the racial, ethnic, and sexual composition of the population. Affirmative action does not require exact parity representation of minorities and women in each and every department or office in the university. It does suggest, however, that when minorities and/or women are substantially underrepresented or overrepresented in a particular type, status, or condition of employment, or in a department, or institution, close scrutiny of the factors impacting upon the employment decision is necessary.

Among the most useful procedures for implementing affirmative action is the establishing of goals and timetables. In order to establish such goals, employers must conduct a review of their workforce to determine if they are hiring minorities and women in the numbers representative of their availability in the workforce. If such analysis indicates that minorities and women are not being hired when they are available for employment, the employers must take additional steps to improve their ethnic, racial, and sexual composition of their staffs. Based on a projection of expected job vacancies, an employer then sets goals of the projected number of minorities and women which should be hired within a specified period of time.

Goals and timetables should be clearly distinguished from quotas. The setting of goals can be viewed as the articulated expectation of what a university has reason to believe would result under conditions of nondiscrimi-

nation. It is a specification of what the employer should strive for. Quotas, in contrast, involve the setting of fixed and arbitrary numbers, which are neither tools for evaluating personnel practices nor take into consideration merit or minor fluctuations in the marketplace.

There are a number of arguments against the use of affirmative action efforts in higher education settings. Among the most pervasive are suggestions that affirmative action efforts operate counter to basic priciples of merit and violate academic freedom.

Critics of affirmative action argue that race, ethnicity, and sex are irrelevant criteria in faculty selection and, further, that use of such criteria makes the traditionally central issue of merit less important in the selection process. Such arguments are falacious in at least two respects. First, they assume that merit and racial, ethnic, or sexual identification are mutually exclusive. Second they suggest that merit has traditionally been the critical factor in faculty selection and that issues of race, sex, and ethnicity have never been of importance. Such a notion is inconsistent with the systematic exclusion from college and university facilities suffered by minorities and women prior to the 1960s.[28] Such exclusion reflects total reliance on factors of race, ethnicity, and sex in faculty employment decisions. Further, such a suggestion fails to take into account the many relevant and irrelevant factors other than merit that have commonly been a part of the faculty employment decision-making process.[29]

Affirmative action is in no way antithetical to merit, for it merely brings other criteria--race, ethnicity, or sex--into the selection equation. The addition of these criteria in no way minimizes consideration of qualifications or accomplishment. It allows for the fair competition for access to institutions that have systematically, or in a discriminatory manner, excluded minorities and women.

A second specious argument against affirmative action in colleges and universities states that affirmative action efforts violate academic freedom. Traditionally, the concept of academic freedom has meant that faculty in colleges and universities would be able to teach, write, and research without outside interference. It was intended to protect scholars from attack, denunciation, and retribution for pursuing study and/or teaching of unpopular academic, scientific, or philosophical issues and questions. Currently, an important component of academic freedom is the peer review process, a confidential process whereby faculty assess the appropriate exercise of academic freedom among their peers, and evaluate candidates for faculty employment and promotion. Peer review is a secret process in the interest of privacy for the individual candidate, but also ostensibly to insure independence--academic freedom--in making such decisions.

In recent years, the concept of academic freedom has been expanded to include freedom from any attempt at government regulation of university functioning. It now functions as "an extra-legal, extra-constitutional

privilege unique to academia" which has been used to ward off compliance of federal and state regulations many focused on equal employment opportunity. Academic freedom and the importance of the peer review process have been invoked in defense of university policies and procedures which have little to do with protection of faculty or institutions from retaliation for the study or teaching of unpopular or threatening ideas.[30]

Expansion of the notion of academic freedom so as to escape government equal opportunity regulations sets colleges and universities apart from other public institutions and improperly suggests that they are above the laws of the land. As the U.S. Court of Appeals noted in its decision on the Dinnan case:

> "Though we recognize the importance of academic freedom, we must also recognize its limits. The public policy of the United States prohibits discrimination; Professor Dinnan and the University of Georgia are not above the policy. To rule otherwise would mean that the concept of academic freedom would give any institution of higher learning a carte blanche to practice discrimination of all types."[31]

Recommendations

The following recommendations reflect not only MALDEF's recommendations on affirmative action in higher education but those of numerous faculty, staff, administration and higher education researchers who met with us in June of 1981 to discuss Hispanic access to higher education.

1. POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS MUST CONTINUE TO PRESS FOR AGGRESSIVE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EFFORTS TO INSURE THAT MINORITIES ARE ACCORDED EQUAL TREATMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION.

We are deeply concerned that support for affirmative action in California's post-secondary institutions is waivering in the face of growing opposition. Critics allege that affirmative action is unnecessary for institutions which no longer discriminate in their hiring processes. None of these arguments withstand close scrutiny.

Despite protestations to the contrary, the prejudice and descrimination that affirmative action was intended to remedy are very much in existance in higher education today. So long as the problems remain, there is no reason to weaken or abandon affirmative action efforts. Indeed, without the affirmative action requirements contained in state and federal policies, participation of minorities and women in higher education would be even lower.

Until the underrepresentation of minorities in higher education is alleviated, public bodies, including the legislature, must require affirmative action measures to promote the integration of Hispanics into postsecondary institutions.

2. POST SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS MUST ESTABLISH GOALS AND TIMETABLES TO MEASURE EFFORTS IN RECRUITING AND HIRING MINORITIES AND WOMEN.

Affirmative action cannot rely solely on good faith efforts unaccompanied by measureable standards. Goals and timetables are the primary mechanism by which educational institutions can measure progress towards increasing the number of minorities in the work-force. Such numerical goals are targets for the selections of qualified minority and women candidates. They are not rigid formula which require the selection of protected class group members without regard to merit.

3. STAFF AND MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS SHOULD FOCUS ON MINORITY STAFF.

One of the common themes articulated by Hispanics in higher education is that while minorities are being hired at entry level positions, colleges and universities do not recruit and promote minorities to higher level management positions and tenured faculty slots.

Faculty and staff management development programs could function to increase the pool of minority and women eligible for promotion. For example, the University of California has developed a management development program whereby staff or faculty work with a mentor, usually a vice-president or a vice-chancellor, for up to one year. This program allows junior staff or faculty exposure to high level administrative processes and personnel. This program, and others of a similar nature, have enormous potential for enabling minorities to compete more effectively for high level management positions.

To date, university faculty and staff management development programs have not included minorities in sufficient numbers. Greater efforts must be made to include minorities and women in such programs, or to establish programs specifically for minority faculty and staff.

4. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EFFORTS MUST BE UNDERTAKEN TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF MINORITY STUDENTS IN GRADUATE PROGRAMS.

Faculty affirmative action depends on a qualified pool of candidates available for faculty employment. The continuing unequal enrollment of minority students and the uneven distribution of minorities among graduate departments, threatens the future success of affirmative action employment programs. A multifaceted effort must be undertaken.

First, there needs to be a coordinated systematic approach to graduate student recruitment. At the present, most graduate affirmative action efforts have been sporadic and have not been coordinated among the various institutions

or systems. Second, inadequate financial aid has proven to be a dilemma in enrolling and retaining minority students in graduate programs. Unless the legislature responds with some type of financial aid program specifically focusing on the needs of minority graduate students, few minority students will be financially able to undertake graduate study. Third, the Legislature must insist that measurable goals be established each year in recruitment and admission of minorities into graduate departments. Funds designated for university affirmative action efforts should be used to assist more minorities and women into graduate schools.

Footnotes

[1]Jorge C. Rangel and Carlos M. Alcala, "Project Report: De Jure Segregation of Chicanos in Texas Schools," Narvard Civil Rights - Civil Liberties Law Review 7 (March, 1972) :307-391.

[2]Ibid.

[3]National Center for Education Statistics, The Condition of Education for Hispanic Americans (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980).

[4]U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, The Unfinished Education, Report II - Mexican American Education Study (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971).

[5]National Center for Educational Statistics, Hispanic Education, p. 22.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Ronald W. Lopez, Arturo Madrid-Barela, and Reynaldo Flores Macias, Chicanos in Higher Education: Status and Issues (Los Angeles: University of California Chicano Studies Center Publications, 1976).

[8]John E. Fleming, Gerald R. Gill, and David H. Swinton, The Case for Affirmative Action for Blacks in Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1978).

[9]National Center for Educational Statistics, Hispanic Education, p. 140.

[10]Ibid.

[11]California Postsecondary Education Commission, Equal Educational Opportunity in California Postsecondary Education, Part III (Sacramento, CA: California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1980), p. 9.

[12]Ibid.

[13]U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of Population, Supplementary Report PC 80-51-1 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981).

[14]U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of Population, Supplementary Report PC 80-51-1 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981).

[15]California Postsecondary Education Commission, Equal Educational Opportunity Part III, p. 10.

[16]California Postsecondary Education Commission, Equal Educational Opportunity Part III; National Center for Educational Statistics, Hispanic Education.

[17]California Postsecondary Education Commission, Equal Educational Opportunity Part III, p. 4.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Lopez, Madrid-Barela, and Macias, Chicanos in Higher Education.

[20]National Board on Graduate Education, Minority Group Participation in Graduate Education (Washington, D.C.: National Board on Graduate Education, 1976), p. 45; National Center for Educational Statistics, Hispanic Education, p. 164.

[21]"Changes in Graduate Education from Fall, 1979 to Fall, 1980," Chronicle of Higher Education, 15 June 1981, p.

[22]National Center for Education Statistics, Hispanic Education, p. 202; Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Higher Education Staff Information Report (EEO-6) (Washington, D.C.: Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 1979).

[23]California Postsecondary Education Commission, Preliminary Report: AB 105 Study - Sex and Ethnicity of Faculty and Staff in California Public Colleges and Universities (Sacramento, CA: California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1979).

[24]Ibid.

[25]National Center for Education Statistics, Hispanic Education, p. 202.

[26]California Postsecondary Education Commission, AB 105 Study.

[27]Ibid.

[28]Fleming, Gill, and Swinton- The Case for Affirmative Action, p. 89.

[29]"The Ladd-Lipset Survey," Chronicle of Higher Education, 1 March 1976, p. 12.

[30]B. Haber, "Why Not The Best and The Brightest - Equal Opportunity vs. Academic Freedom," Forum, January 1981, p. 22.

[31]"Test of Appeals-Court Opinion in Georgia Tenure-Vote Case," Chronicle of Higher Education, 25 November 1981, p. 14.

Appendix F

VITA

David Jess León
2908 Florence Street
Berkeley, CA 94705

Born: August 1, 1947
Los Angeles, CA

Home Phone: (415) 843-4523
Office Phone: (415) 981-5800

Formal Education

Institution	Degree	Year
University of California, Santa Barbara	Ph.D. Sociology	1976
University of California, Riverside	M.A. Sociology	1970
California State University, Long Beach	B.A. Sociology	1969

Fellowships and Honors

Ford Foundation Dissertation Fellowship for Mexican-Americans — 1973-74

Ford Foundation Advanced-Study Fellowship for Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans — 1971-73

University Campus Fellowship, University of California, Santa Barbara — 1970-71

Graduate Educational Opportunity Fellowship, University of California, Riverside — 1969-70

President's Honor List, California State University, Long Beach — 1968-69

Administrative-Research Experience

Program Coordinator/Scholar-in-Residence — 1979-Present
Minorities and Women in Advanced Study and Research
Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF)
San Francisco, CA

Teaching Experience

Assistant Professor 1974-80
School of Education
University of California
Berkeley

Professional Activities

Panelist, Second National Higher Education Minority Student Workshop, November 23-26, 1980, Atlanta, Georgia.

Chairman, A Direction for the 1980's, 5th Annual Raza Administrators & Counselors in Higher Education Conference, September 11-13, 1980, Fresno, California.

Discussant, The Challenge of the 1980's, Southeast Conference on the Education of Hispanics, May 7-9, 1980, Miami, Florida.

Facilitator, First National Higher Education Minority Student Workshop, November 7-9, 1979, Atlanta, Georgia.

Discussant, Higher Education of Chicanos: Status, Issues, and Policy, April 27-29, 1978, Los Angeles, California.

Discussant, Annual Conference on Ethnic and Minority Studies, April 19-22, 1978, University of Wisconsin, La Crosse.

Discussant, Regional Conference on Community Information in Education, March 22-23, 1978, San Francisco, California.

Discussant, National Conference on Race and Ethnic Data in Higher Education, February 6-7, 1976, Howard University, Washington, D.C.

Discussant, Conference on Alternative Higher Education for Chicanos, December 28-29, 1975, Berkeley, California.

Discussant, Conference on Educational Opportunities in Psychology for Mexican Americans, May 17-18, 1973, University of California, Riverside.

Consultant, Conference on Mexican Americans and Educational Change, May 21-22, 1971, University of California, Riverside.

Professional Associations

American Sociological Association

American Educational Research Association

Pacific Sociological Association

Sociology of Education Association

Professional Activities

Reader, Sociology of Education

Reviewer, Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews

Publications

The Struggle for Access: Minority Students in a California University. Center for Mexican American Studies, University of Texas Press, 1981.

"Racism in the University" to be published by the Humboldt Journal of Social Relations.

"Chicano College Dropouts and the Educational Opportunity Program: Failure After High School?" High School Behavioral Science 3 (Fall, 1975).

Papers

"Hispanics and the Extended Opportunity Programs in California Community Colleges." Paper presented at the Southeast Conference on Education of Hispanics, Miami, May, 1980.

"The Dream of South Mountain." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Pacific Sociological Association, San Francisco, April, 1980.

"Institutional Racism and the Educational Opportunity Program." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, Boston, September, 1979.

"Racism in the University: The Case of the Educational Opportunity Program." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, September, 1978.

"An Exploration of the Dropout Problem: Chicano Students in a California University." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, New York, September, 1973.

References

Dr. Raul Cardenas, President
South Mountain Community College
2406 South 24th Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85034

Dr. Eduardo Marenco, Director
Policy Studies and Research Department
MALDEF
28 Geary Street
San Francisco, California 94108

Dr. Harvey Molotch
Professor of Sociology
Department of Sociology
University of California
Santa Barbara, California 93106

Dr. Manuel Ramirez, III
Professor of Psychology
Department of Psychology
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

Dr. Reyes Ramos, Chair
Associate Professor
Mexican American Studies Department
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80302

VITA

M. SUSANA NAVARRO

Name: M. Susana Navarro
Address: 26 Crestline Dr., Apt. 5
San Francisco, CA 94131
Phone: (415) 641-4979

Education

Ph.D. - Stanford University, April, 1980
Major field of study -
Educational Psychology
Minors -
Psychology
Evaluation

B.A. - University of Texas/El Paso, 1968
Major - Political Science
Minor - English Literature

Publications

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Mexican American Education in Texas: A Function of Wealth. Report II of the Mexican American Education Study. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972. (Co-author)

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Toward Quality Education for Mexican Americans. Report VI of the Mexican American Education Study. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974. (Co-author)

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. The Challenge Ahead Equal Opportunity in Referral Unions. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976. (Contributing author)

Publications (continued)

"The Study of Mexican American Education in the Southwest: Implications of Research by the Civil Rights Commission." In R. de la Garza & T. Arciniega (Eds.) Chicanos and Native Americans. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Fellowships and Awards

Ford Foundation Fellowship for Graduate Study, 1976 - 1979.

Bay Area Bilingual Education League Graduate Fellowship, 1975 - 1976.

Stanford University Graduate Fellowship, 1974 - 1975.

Appointed to membership in the Stanford University Evaluation Consortium, 1975 - 1979.

Employment and Experience

1/81 - Present - Scholar-in-Residence, Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, San Francisco, CA

Am currently serving as Scholar-in-Residence and Director of the Women and Minorities Project. Am focusing on research issues of concern to Hispanics: in developing proposals for study, stimulating and participating in research in progress and consulting with legal staff regarding education litigation and policy analysis.

9/80 - 12/80 - Lecturer, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA

Taught course in education, Issues in Bilingual Education at UC Santa Cruz. Course focus was analysis of policy and decision making affecting bilingual education. Enrollment comprised of graduate and upper level undergraduate students. Class format was lecture/discussion. Course syllabus attached.

6/80 - 8/80 - Instructor, Gavilan Community College, Gilroy, CA

Employment and Experience (continued)

Taught Introductory Psychology to beginning junior college students. Wide variation among students in class, from recent high school graduates to middle-aged men and women seeking new careers. Class format was lecture. Course syllabus attached.

1/78 - 4/80 - Full-time Doctoral Student, Stanford University, Stanford, CA

Concentrated efforts on my doctoral thesis and completed all degree requirements. Degree conferred April, 1980.

Study examined Witkin's field dependence/independence (FDI) construct in relation to Chicano students and assessed effect of a test tuning, or warm-up procedure on FDI performance. Study was motivated by concerns about validity of past FDI research involving Chicano subjects. Because thesis was not done in conjunction with an ongoing research projects, I was provided with extensive experience at all stages of study.

Doctoral committee: Richard E. Snow, primary advisor, Arturo Pacheco, and Rosedith Sitgreaves.

11/76 - 6/78 - School Psychologist, Gilroy Unified School District, Gilroy, CA

Was employed on part-time basis as school psychologist. Primary responsibilities included testing and evaluation of students with special needs, placement of such students into special programs, development of instructional plans for students in special classes, and counseling. Served as the psychologist for all students requiring bilingual testing and counseling.

1/77 - 7/77 - Research Consultant, Resource Development Institute, Palo Alto, CA

Served as testing and statistical consultant on project to develop test of Spanish language proficiency. Primary responsibilities included development of field study and research design for testing reliability and validity of instrument. Design specified all aspects of validation work, from method for selecting schools and students for field test, to data analysis and interpretation possible from such data.

Employment and Experience (continued)

4/75 - 11/76 - Research Assistant, Dr. Richard E. Snow, Stanford University, Stanford, CA

Selected as research assistant for project examining individual differences in learning related processes. Was involved in literature review and questionnaire development in specified areas of project. Also participated in testing and interviewing of high school and college students who participated in study.

6/75 - 9/75 - Research Intern, Dr. Edward Aguirre, U.S. Office of Education, San Francisco, CA

Position involved consulting with regional commissioner and with project directors in regional office on varied topics. Topics included methods for providing technical assistance to educational institutions within region, consortium development among educational institutions in region, and research projects of interest in region. Also had opportunity to assess activities delegated to OE regional offices, role and methods of operation of OE regional offices vis-à-vis OE Washington office and other federal agencies.

3/75 - 6/75 - Teaching Assistant, Dr. Nathaniel Gage, Stanford University, Stanford, CA

Position afforded opportunity of leading a weekly two-hour discussion session with twelve graduate students. Acted as facilitator for discussions, defined topics for discussion, moderated meetings and assisted students in resolving problems encountered in class. Was also responsible for testing and evaluating students in my section.

10/71 - 6/74 - Research Analyst, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.

Assisted in research and writing on three projects. Majority of time was spent working on Mexican American Education Study, designed to review educational opportunities available to Chicano students in Southwest. Assessed feasibility of several proposed reports, with particular emphasis on a proposed school financing report. Assigned as co-investigator on school finance

Employment and Experience (continued)

project. Work involved literature review, interviewing of school finance experts, data analysis and interpretation, and report writing. With co-author wrote separate document outlining recommended changes in Texas school financing system. Consulted with staff attorneys about statutory schemes and case law in area of school financing.

Had major responsibility for sixth and final report of Study, with examined policies and practices in Southwestern schools in several areas. Responsible for all work on one section of report, including literature review, hypothesis development, instrument development, data collection, analysis and interpretation, and report writing. Assisted in review and editing of all other sections of report.

In addition to work on Mexican American Education Study, assisted in development and design of portions of two other projects: the Media Project and the Labor Union Project. Involvement less extensive than on education study, but assisted in critical phases of both projects. Wrote section of labor union report.

While at Commission served as Commission representative at meetings of educators, legislators, citizens groups and at press conferences. Assisted in development and writing of testimony for congressional hearings and court proceedings. Assisted in reviewing and/or editing reports, or proposals for reports, on wide range of topics of concern to Commission.

References

Dr. Richard E. Snow
Stanford University

Dr. Lee Cronbach
Stanford University

Dr. Arturo Pacheco
Stanford University

Dr. Concepcion Valadez
University of California/Los Angeles

Dr. Ron Henderson
University of California/Santa Cruz

VITA
RUBEN WILLIAM ESPINOSA

Home Address:	5631 Lake Park Way Drive #7 La Mesa, California 92041
Business Address:	College of Education San Diego State University (ICP) San Diego, California 92182 Phone: (714) 265-6403
Citizenship:	U.S.A.
Date of Birth:	June 27, 1948
Marital Status:	Married, No Children
Health:	Excellent
Languages:	Read, speak, and write Spanish. Read French and Latin.

EDUCATION

Post Doctoral Work in School Finance, Columbia University, Summer 1977
Ph.D., Sociology, Stanford University, 1975
M.A., Sociology, Stanford University, 1973
B.A., Sociology, University of California, Riverside, 1971

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION

(1) Sociology of Education
(2) Formal Organizations
(3) Ethnic Relations
(4) School Finance
(5) Basic Research and Design
6) Evaluation
7) Grantsmanship (attracted one-half million dollars from 1975 to 1981)
8) Data Management
9) Public Policy Research

HONORS

Resolution No. 29 passed by the California State Legislature for outstanding achievement in Educational Research, 1978.

Channel 10, a San Diego T.V. station produced two half-hour T.V. shows that documented the purpose, objectives, and recent research results on numerous studies regarding the project directed by Ruben W. Espinosa, Feb., 1981.

Feature article on Ruben W. Espinosa, "Rich School Poor School", in Nuestro national magazine, May 1978.

The California legislature implemented a School finance proposal which ultimately reallocated 165 million dollars which is now yearly serving more districts and needy students. This proposal was developed mainly by Ruben Espinosa in 1978 while working on the California School Finance Project.

Key presenter and a selected leader for the conference entitled the Education of Hispanics "Issues for the 80's" on Financing the Education of Hispanics, sponsored by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, January, 1980, Region IX and X.

Post Doctoral Ford Foundation Scholarship to attend Columbia University, 1977.
Graduate Ph.D. Fellowship recipient at Stanford University, 1975.
Graduated form the University of California, Riverside with high honors, 1971.

EMPLOYMENT

3/82 - present Associate Professor Step I, Tenure Position and Director of the Social Equity Technical Assistance Center, Department of Multicultural Education, College of Education, San Diego State University.

Responsibilities: Teach graduate courses in research and design and direct a research project, with two other full-time researchers, full-time programmer, part-time research assistants, and a full-time clerical position.

10/79-3/82 Director of The School Finance Project, Assistant Professor Step V, Tenure Track Position, Department of Multicultural Educ.

9/78 - 9/79 Associate Director, California School Finance Reform Project, Assistant Professor Step V, Tenure Track Position, Department of Multicultural Education, San Diego State University

8/75 - 9/78 Associate Director, California School Finance Reform Project, Assistant Professor Step I (Part-time), Department of Multicultural Education, San Diego State University

9/73 - 7/75 Research Assistant of Professor M. Dornbusch, Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching

9/72 - 9/73 Research Assistant of Professor Alex Inkeles, School of Education, Stanford University

REFERENCES

Vice-President Tomas Arciniega
Fresno State University
Fresno, California

Professor Sanford M. Dornbusch
Department of Sociology
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Professor Peggy J. Hawley
Department of Education
San Diego State University
San Diego, California 92182

Professor Alex Inkeles
Department of Sociology
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Associate Professor John Meyer
Department of Sociology
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Professor W. Richard Scott
Department of Sociology
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

CONSULTANT TO:

-Legal Aid Society
Chula Vista
San Diego, CA

-Channel Lawyers, Santa Barbara

-Western Center for Law and Poverty
Legislative Branch, Sacramento and
and Los Angeles

-Rand Corporation, Los Angeles

-Chicano Legislative Causus

-Assembly Education Finance Committee in California

-National Orgin Desegregation Centers
1) San Diego State University
2) San Francisco
3) Denver, Colorado

PUBLICATIONS

Espinosa, Ruben W., Inkeles, Alex; Measuring Classroom and School Environments: Manual of Instruments. Volumes I and II, prepared for the educational panel of the Southeast Asia Development Advisory Group (SEADAG) of the Asia Society, New York, June 1973.

Espinosa, Ruben; Dornbusch, Sanford M. et al.; "Student Perceptions of the Link Between School and Work". Technical report for the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching. School of Education, Stanford University, School of Education, Stanford University, 1974.

Espinosa, Ruben W.; Fernandez, Celestino; Dornbusch, Sanford M.; "Factors Affecting Chicano Effort and Achievement in High School", published in Atisbos: A Journal of Chicano Research, Stanford University, Summer 1975.

Espinosa, Ruben W.; "The Impact of Evaluation Processes Upon Student Effort in Ethnic Groups Which Vary in Academic Preparation". A Dissertation accepted by the Department of Sociology and the Committee on Graduate Studies of Stanford University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, May 1975.

Espinosa, Ruben W,; Fernandez, Celestino; Dornbusch, Sanford M.; "Factors Perpetuating the Low Academic Status of Chicano High School Students". Research and Development Memorandum #138, Stanford University, Center for Research and Development in Teaching, August 1975.

Washington Post, "School Discipline: A Double Standard?, William Raspberry, August 29, 1975. This article summarized one of my publications written while completing my graduate work at Stanford University.

Los Angeles Times, "S.F. Minority Pupils Killed With Kindness, Study Says." William Trombley, October 5, 1975. This article summarized one of my publications written while completing my graduate work at Stanford University.

Campus Report, "Warmth Without Academic Standards-A New Form of School Racism?" Dornbusch, S.; Espinosa, R.W.; Fernandez, C.; October 8, 1975. This article summarized parts of my dissertation.

Espinosa, Ruben W.; Garcia, Joseph O.; "Major Student Ethnic Minority Group Concentrations in the California Public Schools", Research Report Number One, prepared for the California School Finance Reform Project in San Diego and the Institute for Cultural Pluralism, San Diego State University, June 1976. Two thousand copies were disseminated and sold.

Espinosa, Ruben W.; Garcia, Joseph O.; "Credentialed Staff-Pupil Ratios by Ethnicity in the California Public Schools", Research Report Number Two, prepared for the California School Finance Reform Project in San Diego, San Diego State University, December, 1976. Two thousand copies disseminated and sold.

Espinosa, Ruben W.; Garcia, Joseph O.; "EDY: A Case of Discrimination in the California Public Schools', Un Nuevo Dia, Spring, 1977, Volume 3, Special National Edition.

Espinosa, Ruben W.; Dornbusch, Sanford M.; Fernandez, Celestino; "Chicano Perceptions of High School and Chicano Performance", published in Aztlan-International Journal of Chicano Studies Research, 1978.

Garcia, Joseph O; Espinosa, Ruben W.; "The California School Finance Reform Act (AB 65): Implications on Bilingual Education", a public policy paper contracted through the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, June 1978.

Garcia, Joseph O; Espinosa, Ruben W.; "An Analysis of the California School Finance Reform Act on Bilingual Education", C.A.B.E. Research Journal, Number Two, September 1978.

Espinosa, Ruben W.; Foote, Tom H.; Garcia, Joseph O.; "Ethnic Groups and Public Education in California", Research Report Number Three, College of Education, San Diego State University, to be published January 1979.

Espinosa, Ruben W.; Dornbush, Sanford M; Fernandez, Celestino; "Chicano Perceptions of High School and Chicano Performance", published in Sociological Abstracts, Fall, 1979.

Espinosa, Ruben W; Garcia, Joseph O.; "A Study of Credentialed Staff-Pupil Ratios by Ethnicity in the California Public Schools", published in Sociological Abstracts, Fall, 1979.

Singleton, Robert; Garcia, Joseph O.; Espinosa, Ruben W; "School Finance Reform and Disadvantaged Children in California". NIE Contract Number 400-76-0136, March 1978.

Espinosa, Ruben W.; "Categorical Funds for Les/Nes Students, Listed by California State Assembly and Senate Districts, County, and School Districts." June 1979, California School Finance Project, Computer publication.

Espinosa, Ruben W; "Credentialed Staff-Pupil Ratios by Ethnicity in the California Public Schools." National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, BIBF database, BE000042, Washington, D.C., 1979.

Espinosa, Ruben W.; "Financing the education of Hispanics; Postsecondary Adult and Career/Vocational Education in 1979." Conference Proceedings for the conference entitled the Education of Hispanics "Issues for the 80's." Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington D.C., 1980. A summary publication of major papers submitted to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The proceedings will be put into ERIC in December of 1980.

Espinosa, Ruben W.; "Reclassification of White School Staff and Students to Ethnic Categories: A White Dilemma." Paper prepared for the Rosenberg Foundation in San Francisco July 1, 1980. California School Finance Project, San Diego State University.

Espinosa, Ruben W.; et. al.,"Analysis of Educational Data Impacting Ethnic Minority Students." Published in Educational Policy Issues Impacting The Ethnic Minority Student in California, Fall 1980, conference proceedings published the National Origin Desegregation Lau Center.

Espinosa, Ruben W.; Garcia, Joseph O., Major Student Ethnic Minority Group Concentrations in the California Public Schools. Published in Research in Education, May 1981, number sp 015314, ED196808, ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

UNIVERSITY, PROFESSIONAL, AND COMMUNITY INFORMATION

Ph.D. scholarship recipient from the Paul Walling Fellowship Fund, 1975.

Elected Council Representative of the Social Sciences for the Associate Student Body at the University of California, Riverside 1969.

Selected to participate as editor for the Stanford Journal of Chicano Research, Atisbos.

One of the founders of the Stanford Journal of Chicano Research.

Elected by the Association of Mexican American Educators as State Representative at the Educational Congress of California monthly meetings on school finance.

Selected as keynote speaker for the 11th Annual Convention of the Association of Mexican American Educators (AMAE), November, 1977. Topic was "Meeting the Challenges of Bilingualism".

Member of Association of Mexican American Educators, American Education Finance Association and the San Diego Zoological Society.

Presently serving on the Comprehensive Examination Committee for Masters Degree in the Department of Multicultural Education.

Thesis Advisor within the Multicultural Education Department, College of Education, San Diego State University.

Assisted San Diego State University's E.O.P. office with school site ethnic counts.

Selected as Assistant Editor for California Association of Bilingual Education Journal, Spring 1981.

Received Recognition Award for the California Association of Bilingual Education for 1980.